

BLUE GRASS BLADE

Founded 1884, and edited by Charles Chilton Moore up to his death, February 1, 1904.

JAMES E. HUGHES Editor and Publisher

Subscription rates.

By mail, postage, \$1.00 per year, in advance.

Five new subscribers sent with one remittance at \$1.00 per year each.

Trial subscription 15 cents per month.

All "foreign" subscriptions prepaid, \$2.00 per year.

MAKE ALL money orders, drafts, checks, etc payable to JAMES E. HUGHES, Lexington, Ky., as this will facilitate collection.

ADVERTISING RATES.

ALL ADVERTISEMENTS of whatever character are to be paid in advance at the rate of \$1.00 per inch per month, unless by special contract, when other and better rates will be quoted upon application. The publishers have the right to reject any and all advertisements offered.

GENERAL BUSINESS RULES.

ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS to the Blade will be discontinued at the expiration of the term for which the subscription has been paid up in advance. The address slip on the paper will show the date of expiration and subscription. Each number of the monthly edition will be sent, it is asked for, upon receipt in case of discontinuance. SHOULD ANY SUBSCRIBER change his or her address, advise this office, giving both old and new, and the Blade will be sent to the new address, as desired.

THE OFFICE of publication of the Blade is at 126-128 North Limestone Street, Lexington, Kentucky, to which all Freethinkers will be given a hearty welcome.

THE BLADE is entered at the Postoffice, at Lexington, Kentucky, as second class mailing matter.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BLUE GRASS BLADE, P. O. Box 388, Lexington, Ky.

Let go the brakes.

Turn not from duty's call.

Trouble followed human development.

Love and appreciation will rule all things.

God's character is made by his worshippers.

A handful of common sense is worth a bushel of learning.

If we had no faults ourselves we could not see faults in others.

He that has much and wants more is poor, but he who has little and wants no more is rich.

A cheerful heart is of greater value than all the prayers that ever been numbed by the lips of men.

Many who are now digging for Greek roots and Latin verbs could render valuable service by studying the esoteric tuber.

Logical minds revolt at the jumble of self-evident theological absurdities and turn to the light of Science to find the cause of existence.

Congressman James of Kentucky, a mere guileless youth from the western part of the state, has appointed himself God's special representative to see that the Christian gosse gets back on our coin.

When the Christian can understand that he will be punished by his sins and not because of them, he will realize the folly of prayer and praise to an incomprehensible fetish in the skies.

The greatest intellectual achievements the world has yet produced came from the brains of poverty, not from the rich. It takes trouble and sorrow to develop character and strength. Flowers are won by toil.

Considering the fashion adopted by some orthodox churches to attach a dance hall and a modern stage as a part of the cathedral, to say nothing of moving pictures shows, the deity will have to get a move on him or the devil will soon have the entire congregation grabbed, preacher and all.

Funny how religions will change. In the old days rewards for orthodox belief came immediately, later they were turned to "injunctions in the skies" while the priests absolved the priests. Religious punishments used to be confined to a few bibles and bad crops, but these have been turned into a literal hell of fire where the souls of unbelievers and unbaptized babes forever burn. Great is religion.

Some indignant correspondent, feminine, writes to assure us that we are doomed for hell. Cen-

sidering those who have gone before even that would be preferable to roosting off some roseate cloud in company with a halo and a harp, attended by a choice assortment of angels. Realizing that the great questions has not yet been answered, who knows, but what it might be the other fellow, who will get it in the neck, after all.

Any religion that is compelled to rely upon secular law for its recognition is inherently rotten. Any religion which must appeal to brute force to secure respect for its god is fiendish and base and unworthy the devotion of a yellow dog. Now take a glance at the history of the religion of Christ, ancient and modern, and estimate its charater in the light of the foregoing suggestion.

Christ had no more to do with the making of the "Holy Sabbath" than Moses had to do with establishing the Fourth of July. Neither was sanctioned by the father, the son, or any of the original saints. Those who insist upon the enforcement and not according to the conscience of the individual.

A SUBSTITUTE UNNECESSARY.

One of the principal stock arguments of orthodoxy when confronted by rationalism, or Freethought, is to ask what to give in lieu of Christianity should its abolition, decay, or death bring about.

What should the answer be?

What must the answer be?

Scientific Truth and Its Application to Human Life.

In the destruction of error nothing is required in its place. A lie is hurtful at all times and in all places. The injury may not be felt immediately, but the result is bound to be experienced sooner or later. The physician is not urged by the sick to give them another ailment in lieu of the one they have been able to conquer. It was the physician's task to destroy the original disease. The destruction of falsehood, like the destruction of disease, is desirable under any and all circumstances and the free mind is left to accept such truth that may come before it without the slightest regard or thought for the old error destroyed.

Accepting this proposition as being the correct view of the method of reaching a stage of intellectual liberty it follows that if Christianity is to be it should be destroyed without seeking a substitute. The human mind does not stand in need of a substitute for falsehood. It does not pretend to offer any substitute. It sets up no code, no system, no creed. To a Freethinker to subscribe to a creed, if possible, would be to fetter the mind and would be violating the very principle of Freethought. The "I think" is the ultimate principle of Freethought. The "I believe" is the requisite of any orthodox religion.

The suggestion that Freethought offer a substitute for Christianity is of no necessity, does not Freethought is to have no object. The Freethinker can and does accept more real human need than the member, or the average believer. This work may not be found in osti- tude, but in the doing of simple justice triumphant, charity becomes unnecessary.

The Freethinker is willing to do the work for his own redemption. He knows that one thing he may do shall be in vain. He knows that he need not indulge in delusive dreams of some future state

grasp the full world will us all. Under a wish to violate the law of God, for many but if he weaves no demand that vain in the direction he really great instead of

tears of blood and toil secured saviors nor upon the shedding of blood on work. The very liberty we enjoy given freely, but it had to be death struggle from the reluctant

Men's salvation does not depend on the charter of various freedom's we must work along less violent paths. Is there a Freethinker in the land, who, in a similar fine, denounces the yoke of mental slavery, his neighbor's neck? We think not. Then it is our the means of our to mankind. We must not shrink the task. It is a duty we have to perform that duty without

ARE YOU A MATERIALIST?

The foregoing interrogatory has been propounded to the Blade's editor by the estimable lady, secretary of the Materialist's Association, and we are proud to state that the affirmative scope this stakes.

There is little of the "spirit" about our people, whether of the distilled variety for which Old Kentucky is famous, of those of which we are told is the kingdom of heaven. Forced by reason and argument, by fact and investigation, we have been impelled to the materialistic standpoint; for there is no other logical position for any mind than but partially informed, to accept.

In another column will be found an article from Mrs. Bliven on the subject, and a communication in which the above question may be found. From what is here said we can have no possible objection to having our name enrolled as a member of the Association, and we heartily recommend the same course to our readers who have reached the same stage in progressive and intellectual thought.

The proposition, however, to establish a section of the Blade to be known as the Materialist Section, is another and different proposition. The Blade is open at all times to communications from any and every member of the Association and a section, just a few inches, would be of so little value that its establishment could not aid in the work to any appreciable extent. Our notion is not in opposition to the suggestion offered, simply a gentle reminder that a section is hardly necessary where the entire paper is devoted to the advocacy of the same principles and subjects.

It may be, however, that members of the Association would desire to group their writings under one head. If that is true, they have but to express the wish and it can be readily done. All articles intended for it should be so marked, or signed; so that the designation place may be accorded them. Such discussions as would thus be created would be certain to prove interesting and the Blade, as well as the Association, would benefit thereby. Mutual interests can be served. The discussions would bring about an interchange of ideas and all profit through reading them.

The Blade can but reiterate that as its pages are devoted to an open advocacy of materialism, and the philosophy underlying it, as the only true philosophy, we shall be pleased to publish any article written by members of the Association at any time.

SUNDAY CLOSING IN COTHAM

New York State has a statute upon its books which prohibits giving theatrical performances on Sunday, but it has been such a dead letter for years, that the play houses have been in the habit of giving Sunday performances, and the people, not only accustomed to it, have actually grown to like it and appreciate it.

That the people do like it has brought on a world of trouble. The dear pastor of the prominent churches suddenly found their congregations himing out and the theaters doing a land office business, and all at once the spirit of avarice, born of business rivalry, began to enter their minds until a united effort was made to shut the theaters up and enforce the old blue law to give the preachers a chance. The result is that the preachers and religious weeklies published in and around New York, have joined in a hue and a cry against the stage, against the theaters and now insist that they must be closed in "accordance with the law."

Of course, every good citizen should "Obey the law." It is presumed that all good citizens obey the law. To the Freethinker this means only the secular law, the statute law of the land. With the preacher there is another law said to be higher and more to be feared for any infraction known as the "Law of God." The statute law is the law of man. The preacher insists that the law of God is higher and of greater authority than the law of man. If this is true, then every preacher in the land is a violator and breaker of the law of God. In the light of the above definition of good citizenship, the preacher cannot be a good citizen. In that event they must also be undesirable citizens. Let us see.

The law of God is supposed to be laid down in the ten commandments. The fourth commandment stipulates that in six days shalt thou labor and do all manner of work, and rest on the seventh and keep it holy. To work on the seventh is to desecrate it and render it unholy. Known facts and common experience show that the preacher rests during the entire six days and works, with his law, all through the seventh. If the mandate is to be regarded as authoritative that rest must be observed on the seventh day it is equally so in regard to the mandate that in six days all labor and all manner of work shall be done. The preacher does not labor in the six days, and he does no manner of work within them, all his work is done on the seventh and his professional duties require him to conform to a system that is the opposite of the commandment in every way.

In any event the churches and their organs are boasting that the "good work in succeeding and that nearly all the theaters have been closed, through their effort. The protest made was declared to be for the benefit of the poor actors and actresses whom the managers required to labor on Sunday. This is the most absurd hypocrisy. The preachers have no regard for the Sabbath save as a cold business proposition and it is a means of

saving grace and cash to them that the Sunday laws were originally enacted.

They prize of Sabbath desecration. How, and in what way? By being happy? By enjoying to the utmost a weekly respite from grinding toil and green fields and fragrant flowers, in perfumed meadows and beside the streams? Is it not better to attend a theater on Sunday and see the portrayal of valuable lessons in human life than to meet in church in solemn conclave and wonder over better? Is not dancing preferable to consigning men and women to hell and damnation? Does a popcorn ball or a bag of peanuts purchased and devoured on Sunday become displeasing to the Lord? The Blade realizes that the preachers would rather you go to church and give your nickels to them instead of the popcorn vendor, but we are asking about the Lord's pleasure, not the preacher's avarice. Then why should they be so persistent in shoving their meddlesome snouts into the business affairs of other people that does not concern them.

Sunday should be so used to give us all a gentle reminder that we are men and women and not mere machines. If we want music we are entitled, using the national constitution, to have a whole broadcast, if we so desire and have the necessary equipment about our clothes to pay the fiddlers. It is none of the preacher's business. They ought to take something for the meddler's itch.

CHRIST A REVOLUTIONIST.

Was Christ a revolutionist?

Answer—He was.

Frequently the question is asked what would he done if Christ should come to this or that town, and the preachers all over the land have discussed upon the subject from time to time. It is a favorite theme where the person wants to do a little quiet knocking from the pulpit. There has never been a sermon preached, to one knowledge or belief, on that subject that has been in the nature of a how-to. It has been on side to camp to a good sized knock in every hamlet and town. Did the pastor of this or that church get a call out from the city officials, the text used for a gentle质 of the "corrupt politicians" who dominate the city government, and a well prepared copy of the sermon is dashed out to the press for "publication" as an item of especial interest. The preachers are not acquire the art of working the press for publication. Some of them will be willing to actually pay to have their "party" printed in the local paper. Again, if a number of business men have failed to clip in when a "list" has been taken round by some dear sister of the faith, he is made a marked man, and another sermon follows the action, they would give "Christ if he came to town." The text is of an elastic nature and can be adapted for use at any old time and under any circumstances.

Now word comes from London that a number of the established energy has broken out of the orthodox trances and in a sermon recently preached the terms Christ a revolutionist. Judging from the history given of him it would be no lie. When the usury-changers oppressed the people by their various exactions, Christ whipped them out of the temple. His followers do not take kindly to hot policy. They prefer to stand in and get a good rake off, which not forthcoming in season or out of season, the text is dug up, resurrected as it were, and what would happen if Christ came is told for their special benefit. If the person wants to get a cash in his pocket by pretending to raise money for a new church, or for extension of missions, and the business men of the community refuse to be caught, out comes the text in a different attire and the treatment would give to Christ if he came among them is a splendid way in which to hold defiance by threatening hell for denying their Savior. If the Church membership is split and small love manifested between them, if Christ should come is once brought into public view and they are told that by quarreling among themselves they quarrel with the Lord.

It seems, however, that the text has been used to some advantage by the English person, for he so impressed his hearers with the revolutionary character of the Christ he preached to them, that they believe him and forthwith proceeded to institute a "reform church" making a bold break from the church established. The more orthodox members of his congregation are said to have spoken right out in meeting and haled him with cries of "no" to such an extent that he had to ask the permission to continue preaching to them even a little longer.

Take it which you will Christ was a revolutionist, if the accounts of him are true. He began by arguing with the doctors and he tackled the lawyers next. When people did not agree he cursed them and called them "whited sepulchres," and children of hell. When a fig tree failed to furnish him with fruit out of season he cursed it and caused it to wither and die. He jumped on the Pharisees and Scribes. He defied the lawful and virulent type. He upset the old Jewish religion and gave one that grew worse with its keeping. I did not improve with age. He revolutionized Judea and destroyed the Roman empire by defeating it with human blood. Is there a revolutionist that could do more, or do that much with so much effect? Could a revolutionist want to do more?

If the preachers would but continue in this strain the orthodox faith would soon be shattered and scattered. The more they turn in the direction of the London preacher the fewer Christians will be found in the land. Speed the good work and let us, as Freethinkers, turn in and give them a boost along the highway.

WAS IT

PEACE OR SWORD

That the Magazine came to bring upon Earth? Get a Few Pointers From The Despised Samaritan.

EFFECT OF RELIGION IN THE SCHOOLS

(By A. A. Snow)

"The government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion," George Washington. "No religion shall be established by law, nor shall the equal rights of conscience be infringed." Constitution of the United States.

"Keep Church and State forever separate." U. S. Grant.

I see the above question is before your readers and to my mind the most intense believer ought to be willing to leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church and the private school. Mr. Andrews objects because he says, Mr. Long fails to claim himself to the statutes. I see but little ground for objecting to the statement, with the constitutionality of it with in his knowledge. It much more, they conflict with just principles, it behoves him to speak out. Would he unite in crying treason against those who objected to Braum's being burnt to death through Christian laws, for his infidelity? Is not his position of taxing the people to support religion a vestige of these same dark ages; with only this difference; the penalty is a little milder?

Antiochus Epiphanes desecrated the Jewish temple by erecting in the stadium of Jupiter. This enraged the Jews so much that a known no good and brought about one of the bloodiest fits of history. A powerful handful of Jews drove Antiochus from the country. As long as history is read Antiochus will be known as the tyrant of his houses. We are forced to build them and forced to send our children there, and because you have the power are you determined to erect your image of Jupiter there, and determined to impress on the tender minds of our helpless children, before their reason has sufficiently developed for self defense, your religion which we count superstitious?

The position that it is absolutely wrong to men and women without it, etc., is assertion only, without is particle of proof. Antiochus made the same kind of assertions and with every bit as much reason. I notice the more ignorant a person is the more he insists that his religion is a panacea for all ills; and so very positive is he about it that he will not allow for others the same right, he claims for himself. If infidelity or Atheism were taught in our schools we would not hear an emphatic protest from our most positive Christians. C. T. Andrews. Were he not a test were a Roman Catholic as teacher of his class, he would be struggling for the release of some of the racists in purgatory and a king the Holy Mother of God, St. Mary and ten thousand other saints to intercede in their behalf; or reading from his translation of the Bible where it squarely contradicts that of the Protestants?

How I am aware that there are thousands of noble Christians who can see the injustice of turning our school houses. At one time the Christians took all the children from the breasts of their heart broken Jewish mothers and adopted them as Christian families. In the place that the Jews, on account of their religion, were incapable of raising them. Now that is my friend's logic exactly. He claims that all morality would go to wreck under Atheism and at the same time advocates a scheme in the name of Christianity absolutely deitite of justice heinous immoral as I have shown. Now if you like that you read to your children is all true polygamy and slavery are right. The gods of the heathens were incapable of doing anything for the people. These heathen, according to the Bible, were "without God and without hope in the world." Then they were certainly Atheists. Yet they were moral, some of them surpassed the Jews in morality, and all from that Atheistic soil that my friend says is so poor that it would not sprout white navy beans. Their gods got their morality (what little they had) from the people get their morality from the heathen, the Golden Rule, (the most noble words he ever uttered) from the Atheist, Confucius?

Now Christians will you not sit at the feet of the despised Samaritan, the Infidel, and learn an important lesson. The Catholic and the Protestant are at all times wrangle, each wanting religion in the schools. Now each of you, throw out religion and have peace.

Oh Christian, will you never learn which it was that the Nazarene came to bring, was it peace or was it the sword?

EVEN BETTER THAN WE CAN.

Roscoe, Ohio.

James E. Hughes:—

I will drop you a few lines in order to send you a few clippings to use as you may see fit. I see in your last two issues that you are up to date, but am sorry to say it is not up to date, with a few exceptions. I am very late. Your last, of the 3rd, came to me on the 13th; don't take this as a complaint as I know you do the best you can.

JOHN McFARLAND.

HIGH PRICED PREACHERS

Methodist Conference Breaks Up in a Row and Preacher Brings Suit For \$50,000.

HOW THESE CHRISTIANS LOVE ONE ANOTHER.

(By Emmett Weeks.)

Is there a preacher in the country whose reputation is worth the sum of \$5,000? If so, point him out. Have his picture made and send it to the general editor, for I am sure the editor would be willing to publish it on the front page.

If the Blade readers do not know of one I would like to call their attention to a preacher who thinks his reputation is worth that much for he has brought suit for slander to recover that amount. Fifty thousand dollars for an ordinary preacher? When?

Let me tell you about it. Some time ago at Malvern, Ark., the Little Rock Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which had been dividing members—into laymen—into factions for five years, and which has been the source of numerous church trials, was brought to a climax with a \$50,000 suit for slander.

Alleging that the continued charges that he once had domestic troubles in his standing as a minister, Rev. James Thomas, the central figure in the long conference fight, has filed suit for damages in the civil courts against G. W. Hester, a Devine, Tex., banker, who came here to testify against Rev. Mr. Thomas before the church trial.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley corresponding with Mrs. Meadows and counseling her to get a divorce so they could be married and go away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going back to Fulton to put to rest the rumors when attacked.

Hester, the accused, was prompted by Mrs. Meadows to be used in the defense of divorce proceedings instituted by Mrs. Meadows.

Will Childress and Wayne Thomas testified to the assault and Henry Oliver said he heard Hawley admit to the court that he was here to testify against Rev. Mr. Thomas before the church trial.

"Prosecutor" Reclaimed.

Following the filing of the suit, Rev. J. S. Hawkins, who has been almost as prominent in the fight as Rev. Mr. Thomas on account of his having been assigned to prosecute the case for the church, was reinstated as a Little Rock pastor. Rev. Mr. Hawkins had been removed from the pulpit and "silenced" for making charges against Rev. Mr. Thomas publicly after the church trial.

"Thomas case" had its beginning in the conference more than five years ago. Rev. Mr. Hawkins was then professor of history and economics at Prescott College and a member of the conference. He was appointed by Bishop Hoss to prosecute the case against Rev. Mr. Thomas, under church indictment, for alleged " falsehood and duplicit."

At the next conference session Rev. Mr. Thomas was acquitted, after trial, a letter of character from Bishop O. P. Fitzgerald of Nashville, Tenn., giving material aid to the pastor under charge.

For his part in the prosecution of the case Rev. Mr. Hawkins declared he was so harassed by friends of Rev. Mr. Thomas that he decided to make a public statement. In the general accusations it was charged that Rev. Mr. Thomas had stated that he (Thomas) had been a prosecuting attorney in California while the records of that state showed that he had never held such office. This was evidence that Rev. Mr. Thomas had a "past," it was contended.

Wife Desertion Alleged.

Then came the allegation that G. W. Hester of Devine, Tex., had known Mr. Thomas to have domestic trouble.

Rev. Mr. Thomas, in refutation, stated he had never declared he was a prosecuting attorney in California and he denied emphatically the entire charge with reference to the Texas trouble.

Meantime the feelings of factions grew and numerous charges and counter charges came before the conference, and each of the instigators an indictment against the other, admitted that they had no proof and never expected to press the charges but made the move for "political effect."

Rev. Mr. Hawkins was summoned before the general conference that met appeal from a lower church tribunal.

In Birmingham, Ala., May, 1906, on and the sentence of "silence for six months" because of his charges against Rev. Mr. Thomas was affirmed.

Banker Escapes Summonses.

When the last suit was filed in Malvern, the "Thomas case" had reached large proportions. Hester was summoned from Texas. His testimony was to aid Rev. Mr. Hawkins in his petition for reinstatement.

The slander suit for \$50,000, however, changed the aspect of the case, and when papers were ready to be served Hester could not be found by the Malvern deputies.

However, without a voice of protest, Rev. Mr. Thomas, who has gone into the "Thomas case" deeper than any other man, for what he calls his own vindication, was restored to his former charge at Little Rock.

ANOTHER PREACHER MADE DEFENDANT.

In a Sensational Damage Suit Filed in a Southern Kentucky Law Court.

From Paducah comes the information that in a calm, clear manner, the Rev. F. M. Hawley, formerly Presbyterian minister at Fulton, told the jury in Federal court that he had been removed from the church at Malvern, by W. W. Meadow, Dick Thomas, T. W. White, James White and others, and beaten with a buggy whip and afterwards knocked unconscious by a blow on the back of his head, in an effort to force from him a confession of relations with Meadow's wife.

He said there were twenty-five gashers on his body caused by the whip. He was struck first by H. T. Smith and he said he denied the accusations and was going back to Fulton to put to rest the rumors when attacked.

Hester, the accused, was prompted by Mrs. Meadows to be used in the defense of divorce proceedings instituted by Mrs. Meadows.

Will Childress and Wayne Thomas testified to the assault and Henry Oliver said he heard Hawley admit to the court that he was here to testify against Rev. Mr. Thomas before the church trial.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

Charles H. Wheeler, for the defense, said he would show that Hawley and Mrs. Meadows were the talk of Fulton on account of their conduct. Hawley and he denied the accusations and was going away as missionaries.

